

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in view of the present amendments and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-30 are pending. Claims 1-3, 10-12, and 21-30 are amended to further clarify the features contained therein. No new matter is introduced.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-13 and 15-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meenan (U.S. Patent No. 7,313,384) in view of Kathail (U.S. Patent No. 6,704,752) and Hind (U.S. Patent No. 6,772,331); Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meenan, Kathail and Hind in further view of Kameda (U.S. Patent No. 5,940,772); and Claims 23-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meenan in view of Hansen (U.S. Patent No. 7,103,018) and Kathail.

In reply to the rejection of Claims 1-3 and 15-22 as being unpatentable over Meenan, Kathail and Hind, Claim 1 is amended to recite, *inter alia*, an information communication system that includes at least two information communication apparatuses interconnected via a network, and

wherein said first information communication apparatus *starts communication* of the predetermined communication information to the second information communication apparatus via the wire circuit *when both the input device of the first information communication apparatus and the input device of the second information communication apparatus receive external mechanical inputs while the first and second information communication apparatuses are connected by the wire circuit...* (Emphasis added.)

As such, amended Claim 1 defines three conditions to be satisfied *before* communication between the first and second information communication apparatuses begins:

(1) That the first and second communication apparatuses be connected by the wire circuit, (2) that the first information communication apparatus receive an external mechanical input, and

(3) that the second information communication apparatus receive an external mechanical input. These features are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references.

As discussed in previous responses, Meenan describes a method of configuring a home-networking system using a host system to store the configuration information.<sup>1</sup> Meenan describes that when a home-networking gateway (115) included in the home-networking system (100) is added to the home network, the host system (120), which manages the home-networking system (100), provides configuration information (124) to the home-networking gateway (115) to avoid manual configuration.<sup>2</sup> However, as acknowledged on page 4 of the outstanding Office Action, Meenan does not disclose or suggest starting communication between the first and second information communication apparatuses via a wire circuit when both the input device of the first communication apparatus and the input device of the second communication apparatus receive external mechanical inputs while the first and second information communication apparatuses are connected by the wire circuit.

Further, Kathail generally describes a system for configuring a router using a centralized database provided in an internet operating environment.<sup>3</sup> Kathail also describes that the centralized database (SYSDB) tracks and maintains configuration transactions so that the router may be reverted to a previous configuration upon a user request.<sup>4</sup> Kathail describes that the router can be manually configured through software configuration commands provided via a computer or other data processing devices operatively coupled to the router using a software program.<sup>5</sup> As acknowledged on page 5 of the outstanding Office Action, however, the combination of Meenan and Kathail does not disclose or suggest receipt of external mechanical inputs at both the first and second information communication

---

<sup>1</sup> Meenan at column 2, lines 33-48.

<sup>2</sup> Meenan at column 6, line 65 - column 7, line 2 and also column 8, lines 8-16.

<sup>3</sup> Kathail at column 5, lines 7-12.

<sup>4</sup> Kathail at column 5, lines 5-15.

<sup>5</sup> Kathail at column 4, lines 53-63.

apparatuses. To remedy this deficiency, the outstanding Office Action combines Meenan and Kathail with Hind.

Hind describes a method of interconnecting wireless devices using digital certificates to avoid manual entry of user identifiers, passwords or cryptographic keys.<sup>6</sup> More specifically, Hind describes that long-term secure pairings between devices (6001 and 6003) may be created by bringing the two unpaired devices into radio proximity, and pressing a button (6020) on *one* of the two devices (6001 or 6003) to transmit a certificate (6030) to the other of the two devices (6001, 6003).<sup>7</sup> Hind also describes that once the certificate (6030) is authenticated, a user may press a button (6060) on the other of the two devices (6001, 6003) to create the long-term pairing.<sup>8</sup>

However, Hind does not describe that button (6020) of a first one of the two devices and button (6060) of the second of the two devices are both pressed *to start* communication of the certificate between the devices (6001, 6003). Instead, Hind describes that transmission of the certificate occurs when the button (6020) of the first device (6001 or 6003) is pressed.<sup>9</sup> In other words, Hind describes that only a single button press on one of the two devices is required in order to begin transmission of information between the two devices. Further, Hind describes wireless pairing.<sup>10</sup> Conversely, amended Claim 1 recites that the first information communication apparatus *starts communication* of the predetermined communication information when *both* the input device of the first information communication apparatus and the input device of the second information communication apparatus receive external mechanical inputs. amended Claim 1 also recites that the external mechanical inputs are received *while the first and second information communication apparatuses are connected by the wire circuit*. Therefore, Hind fails to disclose starting

---

<sup>6</sup> Hind at column 6, lines 10-15.

<sup>7</sup> Hind at column 13, lines 13-20.

<sup>8</sup> Hind at column 13, lines 25-31.

<sup>9</sup> Hind at column 13, lines 13-20.

<sup>10</sup> Id.

communication of the predetermined communication information as recited in amended Claim 1, and does not cure the above-noted deficiencies in Meenan and Kathail. As such, no combination of Meenan, Kathail and Hind describe every feature recited in amended Claim 1, and amended Claim 1, and the claims depending therefrom, are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Moreover, amended Claims 2-3, 10-12 and 21-22 recite features substantially similar to those recited in amended Claim 1, and are believed to be in condition for allowance for substantially similar reasons, together with any claim depending therefrom. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 1-13 and 15-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 23-30 as being unpatentable over Meenan, Hansen and Kathail, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 23 is amended to recite, *inter alia*, an information communication system that includes at least two information communication apparatus interconnected by a network where

said second information communication apparatus setting the communication information received from the first information communication apparatus, *when the communication information is received before a predetermined second period of time elapses with respect to a second trigger signal responsive to a second external mechanical input received at the second information communication apparatus while the second information communication apparatus is connected to the first information communication apparatus by the wire circuit*, the second external mechanical input being received independently of the network and the wire circuit...(Emphasis added.)

As discussed above, and acknowledged in the outstanding Office Action on page 11, neither Meenan nor Kathail describes an external mechanical input as recited in amended Claim 23. To cure this deficiency, the outstanding Office Action combines Meenan and Kathail with Hansen.

Hansen generally describes a method of handling wireless protocol sessions to reduce redundant information.<sup>11</sup> In one embodiment, Hansen describes that a server (220) defines a period of time during which a user profile from a communication terminal device (100) information can be stored its database memory.<sup>12</sup> Upon expiration of the defined period of time, the server (220) deletes the user profile information such that the terminal device (100) must submit a new user profile to the server (200) in order to create a new session for any additional communications.<sup>13</sup>

However, Hansen does not describe that transmission of the new user profile must be made to the server within a specified time limit. Instead, Hansen describes that user profiles stored on the server (220) are valid only during a defined period of time, and are afterwards deleted.<sup>14</sup> In other words, Hansen merely describes user profile persistency on a server implementing wireless communication sessions. Nowhere, however, does Hansen describe that the user profile must be submitted to the server within a specific amount of time, much less that such information must be submitted to the server (200) within a specified amount of time relative to an external mechanical input to the server (200). As such, Hansen does not cure the above-noted deficiencies in Meenan and Kathail, and no combination of Meenan, Hansen and Kathail describes every feature recited in Claim 23. As such, amended Claim 23 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Amended Claims 24-30 also recite features substantially similar to those recited in amended Claim 23, and are believed to be in condition for allowance for substantially similar reasons. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 23-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

---

<sup>11</sup> Hansen at column 3, lines 13-15.

<sup>12</sup> Hansen at column 7, lines 13-15.

<sup>13</sup> Hansen at column 7, lines 24-30.

<sup>14</sup> Hansen at column 7, lines 13-30.

As all other rejections of record rely upon Hind and/or Hansen for describing the above-distinguished features, and the above-distinguished features are not disclosed or suggested by Hind and/or Hansen, alone, in combination or in combination with any other art of record, it is respectfully submitted that a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained relative to Claim 14. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

For the reasons discussed above, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-30 is earnestly solicited.


Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Bradley D. Lytle  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40,073

Aldo Martinez  
Registration No. 61,357